

Guildford Borough Council

Report to: Executive

Date: 23 November 2023

Ward(s) affected: All wards

Report of Director: Community Wellbeing

Author: Liz Mockeridge, Waste Strategy and Technical Support Lead

Tel: 01483 445088

Email: Liz.Mockeridge@guildford.gov.uk

Lead Councillor responsible: Cllr George Potter

Tel: 07411 005115

Email: George.potter@guildford.gov.uk

Report Status: Open

Recycling Policy Review

1. Executive Summary

The purpose of this report is to make recommendations for recycling and waste related policy change. The review and its subsequent recommendations have been driven from the service challenge procedure and are focused on making the service more cost efficient for the taxpayer without substantial environmental or customer service impact.

The recommendations cover 5 areas: The operation of recycling bring sites; the provision of refuse and recycling sacks to properties without space for wheeled bins; the provision of indoor use food waste caddies; the provision of kerbside food waste caddies and the provision of recycling bins. The options for each are detailed in 7.

2. Recommendation to Executive

That the Executive approves:

- 2.1. The closure of the recycling 'bring' sites across the borough, converting two – Station Parade in East Horsley and Portsmouth Road in Guildford – to flats recycling collection points.
- 2.2. To cease the supply of refuse sacks to the 1,917 properties that currently receive them but to continue the supply of recycling sacks.
- 2.3. To cease supplying 7L internal food waste caddies for use in residents' kitchens.
- 2.4. To continue to supply 23L external kerbside food waste caddies.
- 2.5. To continue the supply of recycling bins.

3. Reason(s) for Recommendation:

- 3.1. Acceptance of the proposals to close the bring sites, cease the supply of refuse sacks and cease the supply of 7L internal food waste caddies allows a reduction in costs to the taxpayer with relatively little operational or customer service impact. Continuing the supply of 23L external kerbside food waste caddies and recycling bins allows the current service provision to continue uninterrupted while we wait for the impending recycling service regulatory update.

4. Exemption from publication

- 4.1. None.

5. Purpose of Report

- 5.1. The purpose of this report is to recommend policy changes to ensure that the service remains relevant and cost effective for the council taxpayer.

6. Strategic Priorities

- 6.1. To engage with residents and businesses to encourage them to act in more environmentally sustainable ways through their waste, travel and energy choices.
- 6.2. The proposals in this report aim to meet the above strategic priority through the more efficient use of the council's kerbside services and appropriate waste management at the kerbside.

7. Background

- 7.1. Following the Service Challenge process, a number of options were identified to review policy with the intention of lowering costs to the taxpayer. These considered the operation of bring sites, the supply of sacks, the supply of food waste caddies and the supply of recycling bins.

'Bring' sites

- 7.2. We currently operate 22 bring sites of various sizes and locations across the borough. Some of the sites are owned by Guildford while others are operated with permission from the landowners. At some sites we have given authorisation for all the containers while others give permissions to collection organisations directly. For example, we fully control the Portsmouth Road site while at Coronation Gardens Ash Parish Council own the land and control who has permission to deposit banks at the site. These were introduced before good kerbside recycling services were established so are now a duplication of what can be collected from most properties. There are two sites that provide recycling facilities for local flats above shops where there is not space for recycling provision. These are at Station Parade in East Horsley and Portsmouth Road Car Park in Guildford.
- 7.3. The full list of sites is shown in table 1, below. These sites were last reviewed and refurbished in 2013 so are due a programme of work to refurbish the banks, this is expected to cost a one off figure of £3,778. The current provision of banks for Waste Electrical and Electronic

Equipment (WEEE) banks is due to cease in late 2023 through a separate review by the providers, Surrey County Council.

Site name	Locality	Card	Plastics	Metals	Glass	Textiles	WEEE
Artington Park and Ride	Guildford	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Coronation Gardens Recreation Ground	Ash	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Carrington Recreation Ground	Ash	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Station Parade Car Park Access Road	East Horsley	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Guildford Park Avenue Car Park	Guildford	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Portsmouth Road Car Park	Guildford	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Ash Football Club	Ash	N	N	N	Y	N	N
Spectrum Leisure Centre	Guildford	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bright Hill Car Park	Guildford	N	N	N	N	Y	N
Merrow Village Hall	Merrow	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Normandy Cricket Club	Normandy	N	N	N	Y	N	N
Tesco's	Guildford	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Park Barn Community Centre	Guildford	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Albury Village Hall	Albury	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Fairlands Community Centre	Guildford	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Gomshall Train Station	Gomshall	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Onslow Village Hall	Guildford	N	N	N	Y	N	N
Lord Pirbright Hall	Pirbright	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
King George V Playing Fields	Effingham	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Shalford Scout Hut Car Park	Shalford	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Tongham Community Centre	Tongham	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Puttenham Pickled Pig Car Park	Puttenham	N	N	N	Y	Y	N

Table 1 showing the bring sites and materials collected across Guildford.

- 7.4. The sites are increasingly subjected to antisocial behaviour including fly tipping, graffiti and illegal use by commercial premises. There have also been issues with rogue banks appearing on sites, these are not authorised and appear to be linked to a company that does not hold a waste carriers licence or other appropriate permits to allow them to collect textiles. Officers have ensured their removal through enforcement action but the containers have repeatedly reappeared next to other banks.
- 7.5. The current sites are emptied throughout the week utilising our domestic and commercial collection crews. At weekends staff clear the sites on overtime. The cost of collections is £26,202 per year.

- 7.6. Three options for the future of the sites have been considered:
- 7.6.1. Option 1 - Do nothing – keep all 22 bring sites operating as currently.
 - 7.6.2. Option 2 - Reduce the numbers of bring sites – reviewing the distribution of sites would lead to a limited cost saving dependent on which sites were closed.
 - 7.6.3. Option 3 - Close the bring sites and convert Station Parade (East Horsley) and Portsmouth Road (Guildford) sites to flats recycling points.
- 7.7. It is recommended that the bring sites are closed and Station Parade and Portsmouth Road sites converted to flats recycling points. This will save both the annual servicing cost of £26,202 and the one off refurbishment cost of £3,778. It also avoids unquantifiable officer support costs and creates a small amount of capacity in the recycling collection rounds to absorb new property demand on the service. This also offers the opportunity to reduce fly tipping by removing the ‘hot spot’ sites and to prevent an illegal commercial waste disposal route, potentially offering an uplift in Business Waste customers.
- 7.8. It is not expected to disadvantage any residents as the services provided at bring sites are already available at the kerbside with excess recycling able to be collected from next to their recycling bins if required.
- 7.9. Costs to closure would come from the removal of the signage and bins from the current sites. Discussions with landowners are also required to establish whether they wish to take on the management of third party textile banks at these sites. A communication plan would need to be developed to ensure that the site closure message is delivered appropriately, reducing the chance of fly tipping after the bank removal.

Refuse and recycling sack provision

- 7.10. Guildford Borough Council have historically supplied both refuse and recycling sacks to properties that do not have the space to store wheeled bins at their properties. This policy was initiated at a time when we supplied the initial issue and subsequent replacement of wheeled bins free of charge. Since 2013 we have charged for the initial issue of both refuse and recycling bins and the replacement of refuse bins.
- 7.11. We currently supply refuse sacks to 1,917 properties and recycling sacks to 3,053 properties. We recommend all properties use refuse sacks, whether or not they have a wheeled bin but do not supply the sacks to those with a bin. Recycling sacks are supplied to ensure that they remain fit for the service operation by being thick enough to safely lift glass bottles and jars in the recycling and to ensure that they are clear enough for our crews to check their content.
- 7.12. Three options for the future of sack provision were considered:
- 7.12.1. Option 1 - Do nothing – continue to supply both refuse and recycling sacks
 - 7.12.2. Option 2 - Supply recycling sacks only – offering a cost saving of £19,136 annually (through the ceasing of supply and delivery of refuse sacks and allowing us to move to a single deliver each year).
 - 7.12.3. Option 3 - Stopping the supply of both refuse and recycling sacks – offering a cost saving of £46,302 annually (through the ceasing of all sack supply and delivery).
- 7.13. It is recommended that option 2 is selected – stopping the supply of refuse sacks but continuing to supply recycling sacks. This will allow an annual cost saving of £19,136. It is recommended that recycling sacks continue to be supplied to ensure that we can retain a safe operation and control of material quality. It has been identified that the cost saving from not supplying recycling sacks could easily be outweighed by the cost of an increase in

contamination disposal with another Surrey authority seeing costs from contamination at £21,000 already in 2023.

- 7.14. The stop in supply of refuse sacks will mean residents have to buy their own. This will be at an anticipated annual cost of approximately £11 for each of the 1,917 residents affected.

Small kitchen food waste caddy provision

- 7.15. We currently supply small 7L internal silver kitchen caddies for use by residents within their kitchens. They are designed to be used to hold food scraps before they are placed into the larger green or black 23L external kitchen caddy – the container used for kerbside collections. The indoor caddy is the only container we supply that is not handled by our crews, only by the resident. The outdoor caddy has to be of a specific size and quality for use by the crews but there are not requirements for the container used by the resident.
- 7.16. The kitchen caddies were introduced in 2009, when kerbside food waste collections were first introduced across the borough. We provided them to ensure that the service was accessible to residents as alternatives were not available locally. This is now not the case and kitchen caddies are easily available from supermarkets, homeware and hardware stores.
- 7.17. Three options for the provision of kitchen caddies were considered:
- 7.17.1. Option 1 - Do nothing – continue to supply the 7L internal caddy for use within residents' kitchens.
 - 7.17.2. Option 2 - Stop supplying 7L internal kitchen caddies – this would save us approximately £7,160 in supply costs annually. There is no delivery saving as we do not deliver these.
 - 7.17.3. Option 3 - Charge for 7L internal kitchen caddies – this charge would need to be around £15 per container to cover the purchase, administration and delivery costs. There would be an online order system development cost of £4,500 and the demand may create an additional

requirement for an additional delivery driver and vehicle as purchased containers would need to be delivered where they are currently collected from Parish Councils and the Millmead office.

- 7.18. It is recommended that Option 2 is selected – that we no longer provide 7L internal kitchen caddies. This will allow an annual cost saving of approximately £7,160. This option is recommended as it avoids costs while avoiding the risk from additional resources being required. Research has identified that supermarkets charge between £4 and £12 for a kitchen caddy so our cost to the resident would be higher and therefore not cost effective for them, leading to low demand from our sticks. This in turn would lead to more storage space being required at the depot due to the slow distribution of stocks.

Charging for food waste caddies

- 7.19. We currently supply all food waste caddies free of charge. These can be collected from a number of Parish Councils and our Millmead office. The larger, 23L external caddy has to be certified by Guildford as meeting specific criteria to ensure that they are safe for our crews to use, to comply with Health and Safety Regulation. Most kerbside caddy replacements are due to caddies becoming brittle over time so issues and failures tend to present at the point of collection.
- 7.20. At this time, the collection of food waste from all properties is not compulsory but the Environment Act 2021 will make food waste collections compulsory for all Local Authorities and is partnered by a ban on biodegradable waste from landfill by 2028.
- 7.21. Three options for the charging for food waste caddies were considered:
- 7.21.1. Option 1 - Do nothing – to continue supplying food waste caddies at no cost to the resident
 - 7.21.2. Option 2 - Stop supplying all food waste caddies – this would provide a cost saving of £7,160 for the 7L internal

caddies and £26,007 for the provision of 23L external caddies. There is no saving on delivery costs as these are not delivered. This option would require residents to provide their own caddies which is expected to reduce use of the food waste service, prompting more food waste to end up in the refuse bins and would raise health and safety concerns stemming from the use of uncertified containers by our crews leaving us liable for any crew injury.

7.21.3. Option 3 - Charging for all caddies – We have identified that we would need to charge around £15 for a small caddy and £17 for a large caddy to cover the cost of the container, administration and delivery costs. There would also be an online order system development cost of £4,500.

7.22. It is recommended that option 1 – to do nothing, is selected. With the Environment Act 2021's focus on food waste it is recommended that we continue to supply the 23L outside caddy to encourage the continued use of the food waste service. The implications for the risk of injury from manual handling injuries by not supplying kerbside caddies are significant enough that we need to retain control of this as an authority to ensure the continued protection of our workforce safety.

Charging for recycling bins

7.23. We currently supply additional or replacement recycling bins at no cost to the resident. In 2013 we introduced charges for the initial issue of a set of refuse and recycling bins to a property, this is currently £60 for the set. Replacement refuse and garden waste bins have also been charged for since 2013, this charge is currently £30 per container.

7.24. All containers that our collection crews handle have to meet a minimum standard and the build has to be checked before the container can be issued for use. This ensures that we comply with health and safety rules. We comply with this by ensuring that we buy these from a supplier who has evidence they have reached the required standard and by testing the compatibility of containers with

our vehicle lifts, the logo on the front of the bin is part of our marking to confirm it meets these standards. In addition, the crews are trained on each manufacturer's container to ensure that they are able to complete a safety assessment before the container is emptied.

- 7.25. In 2019, the government went out to consultation on a number of regulatory changes. These were subsequently delayed by the covid pandemic, and we have been informed that they are imminent but are currently waiting for details on how they may change the design of the kerbside collection services. The Environment Act 2021 introduces some elements but further regulatory tools are expected with more requirements.
- 7.26. Three options for the charging of recycling bins were considered:
 - 7.26.1. Option 1 - Do nothing – Continue to supply additional and replacement recycling bins free of charge
 - 7.26.2. Option 2 - Charge for delivery only – this would provide cost savings of approximately £7,200 annually but would also have an online order development cost of £4,500.
 - 7.26.3. Option 3 - Charge for containers and their delivery – this would generate cost savings of approximately £35,000 annually but would also have a system development cost of £4,500.
- 7.27. It is recommended that option 1 – to do nothing is selected at this time. The uncertainty around the new recycling regulation means that there is a risk of implementing changes that would need to be undone in the short term. It is therefore recommended that this be reviewed when more information becomes available. Charging for recycling containers or their delivery is also likely to cause a reduction in the number of recycling bins in use, potentially driving more recycling into the refuse stream and creating a higher cost to the Surrey taxpayer through higher disposal costs. 2017 doorstepping data highlighted that 64% of recycling bins are full at each fortnightly collection while only 42% of refuse are full at the same collection frequency, suggesting that refuse tonnages

collected from the kerbside could increase where recycling capacity is limited. It would also increase the number of non-GBC bins presented for collection, increasing the risk to the safe operation of collections by our crews.

8. Consultations

- 8.1. The recommendations have been supported by the Lead Councillor, George Potter, and Community Executive Advisory Board.
- 8.2. Officers from Surrey County have been consulted and agreed that the recommendations made are in line with policy adoption at other Local Authorities.
- 8.3. Officers from Guildford's Enforcement Team have been consulted and have agreed an enforcement approach for antisocial behaviour after the potential closure of bring sites.

9. Key Risks

- 9.1. The removal of bring sites offers the greatest risk to the organisation of the options recommended due to the short-term increase in fly tips at these sites after their removal. Mitigation is planned through a combination of early communication, enforcement support and additional street cleaning resources at the removal of the sites. Christmas is the period of peak use for these sites and it is intended, if authority is given, that the closure is communicated at all sites with immediate effect ensuring signage makes the closure clear to visitors over the Christmas period before the sites are removed in January 2024. Enforcement and Street Cleaning teams would be engaged to ensure that any fly tipping after the sites' removal is dealt with rapidly, so as to not encourage more antisocial behaviour, and enforcement action taken and publicised to ensure that repeat behaviour does not occur.

10. Financial Implications

10.1. Adopting the recommendations allows for combined annual cost savings of £52,498 and avoided one off costs of £3,778. This is broken down into the following elements:

10.1.1. Brings sites closure – £26,202 annual saving and £3,778 one off avoided costs.

10.1.2. Ceasing the provision of refuse sacks - £19,136 annual saving

10.1.3. Ceasing the provision of 7L internal kitchen caddies – £7,160 annual saving

11. Legal Implications

11.1. The Environmental Protection Act 1990 (as amended), Sections 45 and 45A requires Waste Collection Authorities (WCA's) to provide recycling collections. The closing of the bring sites does not affect our delivery of this duty as the kerbside collections and the provision for alternative collections to be provided at two of these sites ensures the Council will continue to comply with duty.

11.2. The Environmental Protection Act 1990 (as amended), Section 46, allows authorities to require specific standards of container are used, mandate that they are purchased through the Council or require residents to provide their own for use at kerbside collections. The proposals set out in the report fall within the options permitted under the Act.

11.3. The Crime and Disorder Act 1998, Section 17, requires Local Authorities to have due regard to the effect of the exercise of our functions on, and the need to prevent, crime and disorder in our area. We recognise that the closure of the brings sites may cause a short-term increase in fly tipping and have planned to manage this risk through the plans noted in 9.1.

12. Human Resource Implications

12.1. No HR implications apply.

13. Equality and Diversity Implications

13.1. The Council has considered the Public Sector Equality Duty set on in s149 of the Equalities Act 2010 in the context of this report and it has been concluded that there are no equality and diversity implications arising directly from the recommendations made in this report.

14. Climate Change/Sustainability Implications

14.1. The recommendations could be perceived as acting contrary to improving recycling and waste management within the borough but improves the efficiency of the operation with an associated reduction in vehicle usage.

14.2. Removal of the bring sites will encourage residents to use their kerbside recycling services more than they do currently. This removes vehicle journeys to recycling sites and ensures a more efficient operation from the kerbside.

14.3. The ceasing of supply of refuse sacks will have no environmental impact.

14.4. The ceasing of supply of small food waste caddies will have little to no affect. Waste and Resources Action Programme's best practice guide has identified that customers often purchase their own containers as the local authority containers often do not meet their needs in terms of colour and sizing. It also identifies that the critical container for accessing this service is the larger collection caddy that is presented at the kerbside.

14.5. We are recommending no change in the provision of food waste caddies. It is expected that either charging for food waste caddies or stopping the supply of them would cause a significant reduction in food waste collection service participants over time and an increase in the volume of waste going to landfill.

14.6. We are recommending no change in the provision of recycling bin. It is expected that either charging for recycling bins and / or their delivery would cause a significant reduction in the volume of recycling collected over time and increase in the volume of waste going to landfill.

15. Executive Advisory Board comments

15.1. The following points arose from related questions, comments and discussion for forwarding to the Executive:

15.1.1. It was hoped that, with the possibility of 'bring' sites being closed, residents were aware that they were able to recycle textiles and shoes at the kerbside as a number of communications to this effect had been circulated. The Annual Recycling Leaflet, designed by the SEP on the Council's behalf, would be delivered to each household in the Borough in October, at a significant cost, which included details in respect of local kerbside recycling services. The SEP had a separate communications team supported by the Surrey local authorities which provided an additional messaging opportunity. There was also an option to undertake some publicity in partnership with other Surrey boroughs and districts experiencing similar issues to share costs by pursuing a county-wide campaign. Although the Council's Communications Team could be approached with a view to obtaining a quotation in respect of a communications campaign to raise public awareness of local recycling facilities, the EAB was reminded that the Council was currently experiencing considerable financial challenges.

15.1.2. In the event of the closure of the bring sites, information concerning the alternative recycling services would be posted at the sites and a relatively long lead in notice time would be provided, particularly to take account of the peak use following Christmas. Such closure of the bring sites would involve the Waste and Recycling Team working in partnership with the Enforcement Team following the peak period to ensure that support, within current resources, was in place to tackle any resulting fly-tipping. Posting notices at bring

sites during busy periods was an effective and economical form of communication. In addition, information concerning kerbside recycling was included on the Council's website and social media platforms.

15.1.3. Charity recycling collection banks, which were not situated at the Council's allocated sites, would remain across the Borough to offer a separate service.

15.1.4. Whilst the Council encouraged composting of garden and food waste, many properties had limited space to accommodate composters which made the food waste collection service valuable. Related information was available on the Council's website and the SEP offered residents an opportunity to purchase composter bins such as the 'Green Johanna' at a discounted price to compost food and garden waste. However, one of the challenges with food waste was the expectation that the Government would require councils to provide a food waste collection service from every property by 2028. One reason for this approach was that food waste was beneficial for anaerobic digestion and production of methane and other usable gases.

15.1.5. A Councillor welcomed the recommended options which were felt to recognise and seek to overcome the potential barriers and financial costs faced by residents in readiness for the legislative changes to be introduced in 2028.

15.1.6. The EAB indicated its agreement with each of the five recommendations put forward by officers in relation to bring sites, sack provision, small kitchen caddy provision, charging for food waste caddies, and charging for recycling bins.

16. Summary of Options

'Bring' sites

16.1. The three available options with regards to reviewing bring sites are:

- 16.1.1. Option 1 - Do nothing – keep all 22 bring sites operating as currently.
 - 16.1.2. Option 2 - Reduce the numbers of bring sites – reviewing the distribution of sites would lead to a limited cost saving dependent on which sites were closed.
 - 16.1.3. Option 3 - Close the bring sites and convert Station Parade (East Horsley) and Portsmouth Road (Guildford) sites to flats recycling points.
- 16.2. It is recommended that the bring sites are closed and Station Parade and Portsmouth Road sites converted to flats recycling points. This will save both the annual servicing cost of £26,202 and the one off refurbishment cost of £3,778. It also avoids unquantifiable officer support costs and creates a small amount of capacity in the recycling collection rounds to absorb new property demand on the service. This also offers the opportunity to reduce fly tipping by removing the ‘hot spot’ sites and to prevent an illegal commercial waste disposal route, potentially offering an uplift in Business Waste customers.
- 16.3. It is not expected to disadvantage any residents as the services provided at bring sites are already available at the kerbside with excess recycling able to be collected from next to their recycling bins if required.
- 16.4. Costs to closure would come from the removal of the signage and bins from the current sites. Discussions with landowners are also required to establish whether they wish to take on the management of third party textile banks at these sites. A communication plan would need to be developed to ensure that the site closure message is delivered appropriately, reducing the chance of fly tipping after the bank removal.

Refuse and recycling sack provision

- 16.5. The three options with regards to future of sack provision are:
- 16.5.1. Option 1 - Do nothing – continue to supply both refuse and recycling sacks

- 16.5.2. Option 2 - Supply recycling sacks only – offering a cost saving of £19,136 annually (through the ceasing of supply and delivery of refuse sacks and allowing us to move to a single delivery each year).
- 16.5.3. Option 3 - Stopping the supply of both refuse and recycling sacks – offering a cost saving of £46,302 annually (through the ceasing of all sack supply and delivery).
- 16.6. It is recommended that option 2 is selected – stopping the supply of refuse sacks but continuing to supply recycling sacks. This will allow an annual cost saving of £19,136. It is recommended that recycling sacks continue to be supplied to ensure that we can retain a safe operation and control of material quality. It has been identified that the cost saving from not supplying recycling sacks could easily be outweighed by the cost of an increase in contamination disposal with another Surrey authority seeing costs from contamination at £21,000 already in 2023.
- 16.7. The stop in supply of refuse sacks will mean residents have to buy their own. This will be at an anticipated annual cost of approximately £11 for each of the 1,917 residents affected.

Small kitchen food waste caddy provision

- 16.8. The three options for the provision of kitchen caddies are:
 - 16.8.1. Option 1 - Do nothing – continue to supply the 7L internal caddy for use within residents’ kitchen.
 - 16.8.2. Option 2 - Stop supplying 7L internal kitchen caddies – this would save us approximately £7,160 in supply costs annually. There is no delivery saving as we do not deliver these.
 - 16.8.3. Option 3 - Charge for 7L internal kitchen caddies – this charge would need to be around £15 per container to cover the purchase, administration and delivery costs. There would be an online order system development cost of £4,500 and the demand may create an additional requirement for an additional delivery driver and vehicle as purchased containers

would need to be delivered where they are currently collected from Parish Councils and the Millmead office.

16.9. It is recommended that Option 2 is selected – that we no longer provide 7L internal kitchen caddies. This will allow an annual cost saving of approximately £7,160. This option is recommended as it avoids costs while avoiding the risk from additional resources being required. Research has identified that supermarkets charge between £4 and £12 for a kitchen caddy so our cost to the resident would be higher and therefore not cost effective for them, leading to low demand from our stocks. This in turn would lead to more storage space being required at the depot due to the slow distribution of stocks.

Charging for food waste caddies

16.10. The three options for the charging for food waste caddies are:

16.10.1. Option 1 - Do nothing – to continue supplying food waste caddies at no cost to the resident

16.10.2. Option 2 - Stop supplying all food waste caddies – this would provide a cost saving of £7,160 for the 7L internal caddies and £26,007 for the provision of 23L external caddies. There is no saving on delivery costs as these are not delivered. This option would require residents to provide their own caddies which is expected to reduce use of the food waste service, prompting more food waste to end up in the refuse bins and would raise health and safety concerns stemming from the use of uncertified containers by our crews leaving us liable for any crew injury.

16.10.3. Option 3 - Charging for all caddies – We have identified that we would need to charge around £15 for a small caddy and £17 for a large caddy to cover the cost of the container, administration and delivery costs. There would also be an online order system development cost of £4,500.

16.11. It is recommended that option 1 – to do nothing, is selected. With the Environment Act 2021's focus on food waste it is

recommended that we continue to supply the 23L outside caddy to encourage the continued use of the food waste service. The implications for the risk of injury from manual handling injuries by not supplying kerbside caddies are significant enough that we need to retain control of this as an authority to ensure the continued protection of our workforce safety.

Charging for recycling bins

16.12. The three options for the charging of recycling bins are:

16.12.1. Option 1 - Do nothing – Continue to supply additional and replacement recycling bins free of charge

16.12.2. Option 2 - Charge for delivery only – this would provide cost savings of approximately £7,200 annually but would also have an online order development cost of £4,500.

16.12.3. Option 3 - Charge for containers and their delivery – this would generate cost savings of approximately £35,000 annually but would also have a system development cost of £4,500.

16.13. It is recommended that option 1 – to do nothing is selected at this time. The uncertainty around the new recycling regulation means that there is a risk of implementing changes that would need to be undone in the short term. It is therefore recommended that this be reviewed when more information becomes available. Charging for recycling containers or their delivery is also likely to cause a reduction in the number of recycling bins in use, potentially driving more recycling into the refuse stream and creating a higher cost to the Surrey taxpayer through higher disposal costs. 2017 doorstepping data highlighted that 64% of recycling bins are full at each fortnightly collection while only 42% of refuse are full at the same collection frequency, suggesting that refuse tonnages collected from the kerbside could increase where recycling capacity is limited. It would also increase the number of non-GBC bins presented for collection, increasing the risk to the safe operation of collections by our crews.

17. Conclusion

17.1. In conclusion, it is recommended that the Executive accept the recommendations to remove the 22 bring sites across the borough, converting those at Portsmouth Road and Station Parade into flats communal recycling points, to stop the supply of refuse sacks and to stop the supply of the small, kitchen caddies for food waste. The acceptance of the recommendations will allow Guildford to save £52,498 annually from current budgets without significant impact on residents, the environment or health and safety.

18. Background Papers

18.1. None

19. Appendices

19.1. None.